

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated October 7, 2008. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Claims 2-5, 12-15, 22-25 and 32-35 were previously canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 6-9, 11, 16-19, 21, 26-29, 31, and 36-39 are again presented for consideration in view of the following remarks.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the above-identified application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and in light of the following amendments and remarks, are respectfully requested. Good cause exists for the entry of this amendment in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

As an initial matter, claim 11 was objected to regarding the storage of the MAC address. Claim 11 has been amended to clarify the storage of the MAC address; therefore, applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 16-19, 21, 26-29, 31, and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,845,077 ("Fawcett") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,656 ("Hrastar"), U.S. Patent No. 5,835,725 ("Chiang") and U.S. Patent No. 6,058,476 ("Matsuzaki"). Of these, claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 are independent. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The independent claims have been amended to clarify that the key ID is stored in a first location so that the key ID is not recognizable as a converted version of the MAC address and falsification is preventable. Upon validation of the key ID, the MAC address is stored in a location different than the location of the stored key ID. See, for example, the examples in the application including FIGS. 4-5 and discussion of same in

the specification. For instance,

As a sixth step, the client PC 3 returns the original MAC address by reading out the key ID from the HDD 26 and decoding it under the control of the CPU 25, and transfers this to the receiving board 7. Here, since the MAC address had been stored in the HDD 26 in a state in which it is converted into the key ID, the key ID is not recognized by the user that the key ID is MAC address. Thus, falsification by the user can be prevented.

The receiving board 7 writes in the MAC address transferred from the client PC 3 to another area of the flash memory 19 different from the prescribed area in which the software for a receiving board has been written, under the control of the CPU 18, and finishes

(Specification, p.13, 11.5-16, emphasis added.)

Applicants submit that the applied combination of *Fawcett, Hrastar, Chiang and Matsuzaki* does not disclose or otherwise suggest this and other limitations of the independent claims.

In view of the above, applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, claims 6-9, 16-19, 26-29 and 36-39 depend from claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, respectively, and contain all the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least this reason, applicants submit that the subject dependent claims are likewise in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections

which he might have. If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Andrew T.
Zidel/

Andrew T. Zidel

Registration No.: 45,256

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

952692_1.DOC